

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/761,992	01/	21/2004	Jhy-Jyi Sze	JCLA11796	4307		
23900	7590	10/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
J C PATEN		0	MULPURI,	MULPURI, SAVITRI			
4 VENTURI IRVINE, CA		U		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
11.11.12, 0.	. ,			2812			
				DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
	10/761,992	SZE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Savitri Mulpuri	2812	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply secified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 (This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ Thi Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-15 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-15 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	, , ,		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	***		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in Application (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	Ω □ 1 ·	(DTO 442)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date) 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the applicant's communication filed on 10/21/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted prior art in combination with Rhodes et al (US 2004/0178430)

Admitted prior art teaches a method of making image sensor by the following process steps: Providing a substrate having plurality of trenches; forming liner layer on the surface of the trenches; filling insulation layer in the trenches to form isolation regions; forming at least one photosensitive region with the in the substrate between two neighboring isolation regions; forming anti-reflection layer by chemical vapor deposition method, at least covering the photo sensitive region. Admitted prior art teaches forming photosensitive regions by implantation (see fig 1 A-1 B and related description).

Admitted prior art does not teach forming antireflection layer between liner layer and filling layer. Rhodes et al teaches a method of making image sensor by forming silicon oxide/silicon nitride layer "154" in the trench before filling the trench with

Art Unit: 2812

insulation material "150". Rhodes especially mention forming silicon nitride layer to smoothing out the corners in the trench and to reduce stress with in the trenches (see fig. 10fig.13 and fig. 16 and related description para 0044). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form additional layer of nitride in the invention Admitted prior art to reduce stress, which would built due to filling of the insulation material within in the trench. It is well known in the art that nitride layer is acts as anti-reflection layer (see Hong et al US 6,251,746, col.5, lines 57-60col.6, lines 64-68).

Conclusively, Admitted prior art as modified by the teaching of Rhodes, would reduce the light reflected from the bottom and the side wall of the trenches and increases effective area of the photosensitive region of the image sensor and enhances the current generated at the photo sensitive region.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant, at page 5, argues that the instant invention directed to method of fabricating an image sensor device by forming shallow trench isolations formed around the photo sensitive region, there is anti-reflection formed therein to reduce the light reflected from the bottom and the side wall of the trenches and increases effective area of the photosensitive region of the image sensor and enhances the current generated at the photo sensitive region.

However, Rhodes et al teaches forming <u>image sensor</u>, as similar to admitted prior art, with photodiode and transistors with trench isolation regions. Rhodes teaches

oxide/ nitride layer "154" to smoothing out the corners and to reduce stress with in the trench and then filling with material '350". It is agreed with the applicant that Rhodes do not mention nitride being anti-reflection layer, which can resolve the issue of light reflection at the bottom and sidewalls of the shallow trench isolation regions when incident light pass through the shallow trench isolation regions. However, the modified invention of Admitted prior art, as modified by the teaching of Rhodes would not have light reflection when light passes through the shallow trench isolation regions because it is well known that nitride acts as anti-reflection layer. In other words, It would be inherent that the modified invention of admitted prior art as modified by the teachings of Rhodes, that there would not be any light reflection in addition to smoothing the corners and reducing the stress. It is well known in the art that nitride layer is acts as anti-reflection layer (see Hong et al US 6,251,746).

Applicant, at page 6, submits that the material of the anti-reflective layer is not limited to the nitride material and the spirit of the present invention is to form the material layer with anti-reflection property in the shallow trench isolation regions for blocking the reflection from the bottom and the sidewall of the trenches. However, as sated above, the Admitted prior art as modified by the teaching of Rhodes, would reduce the light reflected from the bottom and the side wall of the trenches and increases effective area of the photosensitive region of the image sensor and enhances the current generated at the photo sensitive region.

Applicant, at page, present the explanation of the exhibit A, and such explanation irrelevant to the claims as presently recited.

Application/Control Number: 10/761,992 Page 5

Art Unit: 2812

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Savitri Mulpuri whose telephone number is 571-272-1677. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt, can be reached on 571-272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Savitri Mulpuri
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2812